

Application No. 10/785,468

Reply to Office action of September 22, 2004

are connectable, one each, to and overlapping the second and third snap fittings on opposite sides of the helmet, and further, the chin stabilizer having a central portion that rests underneath a wearer's chin and jaw when the stabilizer is connected to the helmet, the central portion substantially covering the region below the wearer's chin and jaw from the wearer's chin to throat, and thereby substantially covering the open area of a full-face helmet that normally exists between the wearer's throat and the lower forward edge of the helmet, for impeding upward movement of the front of the helmet over the face of the wearer.

2. (twice amended) The stabilizer system of claim 1, wherein the chin stabilizer has a curved portion adjacent to [and in snug contact with] the wearer's throat that is curved for following the shape of the wearer's neck.
3. (unchanged) The stabilizer system of claim 1, wherein the chin stabilizer comprises an outer layer of material, an inner layer of material, and a layer of padding sandwiched between the outer and inner layers.
4. (unchanged) The stabilizer system of claim 1, wherein the chin stabilizer comprises neoprene rubber.

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended a second time, as indicated above, as a result of the October 14, 2004, interview.

During the course of the interview, applicant's attorney, Bruce A. Kaser, demonstrated the invention attached to the bottom of a "motocross" motorcycle helmet. Applicant's attorney also provided the examiner with one or more photographs illustrating how these types of helmets are used for off-road motorcycle racing, in connection with a discussion about how helmet-shift

Application No. 10/785,468  
Reply to Office action of September 22, 2004

on a rider's head can impair the rider's visibility – which, in part, is the problem addressed by the invention.

The examiner's interview summary identifies the only references discussed during the interview (Sowle and Nocchi). The examiner expressed concern that two limitations identified in the interview summary constituted new matter. The examiner took the position in the interview that these limitations were new matter. Without agreeing, the applicant resolved the issue by agreeing to delete these limitations from the first-amended version of claims 1 and 2.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, as set forth above, place this application in condition for allowance. Applicant indicated to the examiner that this paper would be both faxed and mailed to the USPTO. A copy of the examiner's interview summary is attached.

Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed.


Respectfully submitted,

DON RASBERRY

By: 

Bruce A. Kaser  
Registration No. 31,531  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
2600 Century Square  
1501 Fourth Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98101-1688  
Telephone: (206) 628-7653

I, Bruce A. Kaser, hereby certify that this document and its attachments are being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 21<sup>st</sup> day of October, 2004.

  
Name (signature)